DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 245 HE 014 757

AUTHOR Fingar, Thomas; Reed, Linda A.
TITLE Survey Summary: Students and Scholars from the People's Republic of China in the United States, August 1981.
INSTITUTION National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council, Washington, D.C. Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China.; National Association for Foreign Students Affairs, Washington, D.C. China Education Clearinghouse.
PUB DATE Sep 81
NOTE 55p.
AVAILABLE FROM U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse, 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009 ($1.00 each, 5 for $2.00; 10 for $3.50).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Admission; College Faculty; *College Students; English (Second Language); *Foreign Students; Graduate Students; Higher Education; Intellectual Disciplines; International Educational Exchange; Majors (Students); Researchers; School Surveys; Student Exchange Programs; *Study Abroad; *Teacher Exchange Programs; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *China; *United States

ABSTRACT

A survey of 313 American colleges and universities thought to have accepted students and/or scholars from the People's Republic of China (PRC) was conducted in March 1981 by the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse. Usable responses were received from 164 institutions. The responses indicated that a total of 3,467 PRC students and scholars were served from 1978 through 1981. Of this total, 399 were undergraduates, 656 were graduate students, and 1,945 were visiting scholars. Twenty-six percent of the scholars and students from China attend schools in the Far West (primarily in California); the next heaviest concentrations are in New York, New England, and the upper Midwest). Most students and scholars from China are concentrated in relatively few schools. A large majority of all PRC students and scholars are in mathematics, physical science, or engineering disciplines; a far smaller proportion are in the life sciences. However, graduate students in the humanities have increased from 0.5 percent in 1979-80 to 15 percent in 1981-82. Sixty-five percent of the PRC scholars on American campuses in 1979-81 were fully supported by the Chinese government and an additional seven percent received partial support. Additional information covers: English language skills, admissions policies and procedures, visas, and agreements between Chinese and American institutions. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212245

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NAFSA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Survey Summary:

Students and Scholars from the People's Republic of China in the United States, August 1981

Thomas Fingar
Linda A. Reed

NE 014 757

U.S.-CHINA EDUCATION CLEARINGHOUSE

A joint project of:

Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China

and

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

Published by the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, DC, September 1981

Copyright © 1981 by: Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China
National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20418

and

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs
1860 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20009

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China or the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Foreword and Acknowledgments

The number of students and scholars from the People's Republic of China (PRC) on American campuses increased dramatically after relations between Washington and Beijing were normalized on January 1, 1979. Whereas fewer than two dozen PRC citizens were studying in the United States at the time of normalization (all had arrived in late 1978), the number grew to approximately 2,000 by the end of 1979 and reached nearly 6,000 in early 1981. Both countries were eager to dramatize and solidify their new relationship and the desire to send students and scholars to the United States for advanced training was an important factor in China's decision to accept a normalization formula which left the Taiwan issue unresolved.* With no centralized placement mechanism in the United States, how was it possible for the number of PRC citizens on American campuses to increase so quickly? In what schools, departments and specialties have applicants from China been most/least successful? How have college administrators evaluated the preparation and performance of PRC students and scholars? Who has borne the financial cost of educational exchanges with the PRC?

In order to answer these and related questions, the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse prepared and distributed survey questionnaires to American colleges and universities believed to have students and/or visiting scholars from the PRC. The first questionnaire was sent to 168 institutions in December 1979; 133 (79 percent) responded and the results were published by the Clearinghouse in April 1980.** By early 1981, the number of students and scholars from China had increased far beyond the 1979 total and many more institutions were engaged in exchanges with the PRC. In order to monitor developments and identify changes and trends, the Clearinghouse administered a second and more detailed questionnaire in the spring of 1981. The results of that survey, which covered the academic years 1978–79, 1979–80 and 1980–81 with projections for 1981–82, are reported in the pages that follow.

One noteworthy finding concerns the extent to which educational exchanges with the PRC have become so routine that many institutions no longer compile or retain information on Chinese citizens other than that recorded for all foreign students and scholars. The fact that few institutions maintain central records containing the kinds of information sought in our questionnaire often made it difficult for school officials to respond. Nevertheless, it is clear that our respondents made heroic efforts to obtain accurate and complete answers to our questions. Some errors and omissions as well as a degree of double-counting doubtless occurred. However, we believe the information obtained provides an interesting and representative overview of the way in which educational exchanges between the

---

*Note: As used in this summary, the terms China and Chinese apply only to the People's Republic of China and residents of the Chinese mainland.

**_Survey Summary. Students and Scholars from the People's Republic of China Currently in the United States, April 1980._

United States and China have evolved since 1979 and indicates important trends for the future.

We wish to acknowledge and thank the many persons at the U.S. academic institutions who responded to our request for information. It is impossible to list them all individually, but we want to record our appreciation for the time and effort they expended to complete a lengthy and detailed questionnaire. Without their cooperation it would not have been possible to compile the information reported in this summary.

The quality and clarity of our analysis were greatly enhanced by the critical comments of knowledgeable colleagues who reviewed an earlier version of this summary. Robert Barendsen, Halsey Beemer, Peggy Blumenthal, Archer Brown, Mary Bullock, Karlene Dickey, James Haas, Martin Limbird, Douglas Murray, Leslie Palmer and Georgia Stewart were especially helpful. We are very grateful for their assistance and absolve them of responsibility for any remaining errors of fact or interpretation.

We also wish to give special acknowledgment and thanks to Anna Corrales of the NAFSA staff who spent many hours collating and recording the statistical information used in this summary.

The U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse is a joint project of the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China (CSCPRC) and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA). Founded in October 1979, it is supported financially by the U.S. International Communication Agency and will continue as a joint project until December 31, 1981. Thereafter many functions of the Clearinghouse will be performed by one of the parent organizations. (The CSCPRC is jointly sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Academy of Sciences and the Social Science Research Council.)

Any views in this summary are not necessarily those of the CSCPRC or its sponsoring organizations, of NAFSA or of the U.S. International Communication Agency. Any inaccuracies contained herein are the responsibility of the authors.

Comments or questions about this or other Clearinghouse publications and projects should be directed to:

Dr. Thomas Fingar
Committee on Scholarly Communication
with the People's Republic of China
2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20418
202/389-6795

Ms. Linda A. Reed
National Association for
Foreign Student Affairs
1860 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20009
202/462-4811

Additional copies of this publication can be obtained from the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse, 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009.

Thomas Fingar, CSCPRC
Linda A. Reed, NAFSA
U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse

Washington, DC
August 1981

Highlights of the Summary

The Survey In March 1981, the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse sent a detailed questionnaire to 313 American colleges and universities thought to have accepted students and/or scholars from the People's Republic of China. The questionnaire sought information on the composition, distribution, fields of study, Chinese institutional affiliation and other characteristics of the approximately 6,000 PRC citizens on campuses in the United States. The survey also requested data on sources of financial support, admissions procedures, English language ability, visa status, administrative matters, non-academic activities and agreements between Chinese and American institutions. Responses were received from 180 institutions, 16 of which indicated either that they did not yet have any PRC citizens on campus or that they lacked the information requested.

Number of Students and Scholars Schools participating in the survey reported having received a total of 3,467 PRC students and scholars during the 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81 academic years. Of this total, 399 were undergraduates, 656 were graduate students and 1,945 were visiting scholars. The remainder (467) were classified as "other" (primarily English as a second language [ESL] students). Partial statistics indicate that responding institutions expect to receive at least 1,724 additional PRC students and scholars in 1981-82.

Geographic and Institutional Distribution One-quarter (26 percent) of the students and scholars from China attend schools in the Far West (primarily in California); the next heaviest concentrations are in New York (13 percent), New England (12 percent) and the upper Midwest (12 percent). Although more than 160 U.S. institutions have accepted at least one PRC citizen, most students and scholars from China are concentrated in relatively few schools. The ten schools with the greatest number of PRC nationals account for 42 percent of the 1978-81 total; ten additional institutions raise the percentage to 59 and five more, all of which have at least 40 students and/or scholars from China, bring the percentage to 65. The distribution of students and scholars receiving full or partial financial support from the Chinese government reveals even heavier concentration in some of the leading American research universities.

Fields of Study A large majority of all PRC students and scholars are in mathematics, physical science or engineering disciplines; a far smaller proportion are in the life sciences. The percentage of graduate students in the humanities or social sciences is greater than that of visiting scholars, but in both cases these fields represent only a small segment of the total number of PRC citizens on American campuses. Undergraduates, all of whom are privately sponsored, are more evenly distributed among mathematics and physical sciences, life sciences, engineering, social sciences and humanities with the largest percentage in ESL programs.

Institutional Affiliation in China During each of the 1979-80, 1980-81 and 1981-82 academic years, the highest percentage of students and scholars has/will come from colleges and universities in the PRC. The second largest proportion of graduate students and scholars comes from institutes of the Chinese

Academy of Sciences; the smallest number/percentage are from institutes of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences.

Changes and Continuities Between 1979–80 and 1981–82 there is a marked shift in the composition of students and scholars from China. Once the largest category with 61 percent of the total, visiting scholars will decline to a projected 34 percent of those arriving in 1981–82. Conversely, there is a steady increase in both the absolute and relative number of new graduate students (17 percent in 1979–80, 45 percent in 1981–82). Relatively few undergraduates came to the United States prior to the 1980–81 academic year when they constituted 14 percent of the total; the proportion is projected to reach 16 percent in 1981–82. There has been a sharp decline in the number/percentage of students and scholars in ESL programs but a relatively stable distribution among fields of study. The principal exception to the latter generalization is the sharp and steady increase in the number/percentage of graduate students in the humanities (0.5 percent in 1979–80, 15 percent in 1981–82).

English Language Skills Schools have used a variety of methods to ascertain the English proficiency of applicants but 59 percent of responding institutions reported that most students require at least some additional language training after arrival on campus and 52 percent said the same of visiting scholars from China. Aural comprehension is the most common language problem followed by difficulties in oral expression. Reading comprehension seems to cause fewest problems for both students and scholars.

Admissions Policies and Procedures During the 1979–80 academic year, applications from PRC citizens were relayed to American institutions in a variety of unorthodox ways and decisions were made on an ad hoc basis. Procedures have now become regularized at most institutions and administrators and faculty are becoming increasingly familiar with the credentials of applicants from China. Nevertheless, 52 percent of responding institutions reported applying special criteria to evaluate applications from the PRC. Of those applying special criteria, 40 percent stated that they did so as a temporary measure to promote exchanges with China. The most common exceptions to normal policy and procedure involve waiving or postponing required submission of scores on standardized tests such as TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) and the GRE (Graduate Record Examination). Institutions with the largest numbers of PRC students and scholars do not appear to have been markedly more lenient in the application of admissions/evaluative criteria than other schools in the survey.

Financial Support Sixty-five percent of the PRC scholars on American campuses in 1979–81 were fully supported by the Chinese government and an additional seven percent received partial support. By contrast, 17 percent of all PRC scholars have been fully supported by American institutions and only six percent obtained partial support from host schools or departments. The Chinese government provided full support for 29 percent of all students during this same period; fewer than half as many (173 or 14 percent) received full support from their American schools. One-third of all PRC students have been supported by friends or relatives outside China. Patterns of financial support at the 25 schools with the

most students and scholars from China are essentially the same as they are for the responding schools as a whole, but there are two notable exceptions. Whereas 29 percent of all PRC students in the United States in 1979–81 were fully supported by the Chinese government, the proportion climbs to 45 percent at the 25 schools with 40 or more PRC nationals. The opposite ratio exists with respect to support from friends and relatives; 36 percent of all students receive such support but only 21 percent of those at the top 25 schools do so.

Visas The survey elicited information on 2,194 students and scholars holding J-1 (exchange visitor) visas. This figure represents 88 percent of the estimated 2,500 J-1 visas issued to PRC citizens in the period from 1979 through early 1981. Since students and scholars who are officially sponsored by the Chinese government (or under certain other programs) are generally issued J-1 visas, the survey picked up a very high proportion of those with official sponsorship. However, it elicited information on a much smaller segment (41 percent) of those on F-1 (student) visas. This suggests that those on F-1 visas are distributed among many schools not contacted in this survey and that institutions which did not return the questionnaire have relatively more privately sponsored undergraduates than government-sponsored scholars and graduate students.

Institutional Agreements Fifty-two of the colleges and universities responding to the Clearinghouse questionnaire reported having at least one formal agreement with a PRC institution; 17 schools reported multiple agreements. Fifteen (60 percent) of the 25 schools with 40 or more students and scholars from China have formal exchange agreements with PRC institutions, but only two of the five schools with the most PRC nationals have such agreements. Most agreements permit or commit the contracting schools to send and/or receive a designated number of students and/or faculty but they contain a wide variety of specific provisions.

Americans to China Although the survey did not focus on the sending of Americans to China it did elicit information on students and faculty who spent three months or longer in the PRC under arrangements other than those made through the National Program for Advanced Study and Research in China administered by the CSCPRC. Responding institutions reported sending 212 students and faculty to China in 1978–81 and anticipate that 88 undergraduates, 47 graduate students and 81 faculty will spend extended periods in China during 1981–82. The National Program made arrangements for 83 researchers and 40 graduate students in 1979–81 and will support 24 researchers and 22 graduate students in 1981–82. The total number of American faculty and students who have spent three months or more in the PRC since 1978 is approximately 340 (excluding those teaching English).

Contents

		Page
I.	**INTRODUCTION**	1
II.	**GEOGRAPHIC AND INSTITUTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF PRC STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS**	3
III.	**PROFILE OF STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS FROM CHINA**	5
	A. Chinese Institutional Affiliations of PRC Students and Scholars	9
	B. Fields of Study	11
	C. Evaluation of Student/Scholar Performance	13
	D. Continuity, Changes and Completion of Programs	15
IV.	**ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS**	17
V.	**ADMISSIONS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**	19
	A. Evaluation of Credentials	21
	B. Administrative Matters	22
VI.	**FINANCIAL SUPPORT**	23
VII.	**VISA AND ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION**	29
	A. Visas	29
	B. Insurance	30
	C. Housing and Other Problems	30
VIII.	**NON-ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES**	33
IX.	**EXCHANGE AGREEMENTS AND OTHER INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS**	35
X.	**CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS**	39
APPENDICES		41
	A. Institutions that Responded to the Questionnaire	41
	B. Numbers of PRC Students and Scholars Accepted by U.S. Institutions by NAFSA Regional Divisions	45
	C. Responding Institutions that had more than 40 PRC Nationals on Campus during the Academic Years 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81	47
	D. Institutional Agreements	49

Page

TABLES

1. PRC Students and Scholars Accepted by U.S. Institutions . . 8
2. Chinese Institutional Affiliations—Undergraduate Students 9
3. Chinese Institutional Affiliations—Graduate Students 9
4. Chinese Institutional Affiliations—Scholars 10
5. Fields of Study—PRC Undergraduate Students 12
6. Fields of Study—PRC Graduate Students 13
7. Fields of Study—PRC Scholars 13
8. Comparison of Grades of PRC Students to Those of Other Foreign and American Students 14
9. Application Materials Considered Very Helpful or Adequate 21
10. Sources of Financial Support for PRC Students 25
11. Sources of Financial Support for PRC Scholars 26
12. Sources of Financial Support for PRC Students and Scholars, 1979–81 27
13. Visa Information for PRC Students and Scholars 29
14. PRC Students and Scholars in the United States under Formal Institutional Agreements 35
15. American Students and Faculty in China 37

I. Introduction

Using a list compiled from the results of questionnaires distributed at the fall 1980 NAFSA regional conferences, data supplied by the U.S. Department of State and information collected previously by the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse, survey questionnaires were sent to 313 American colleges and universities thought to have Chinese students and/or scholars on campus. The questionnaires were distributed in March 1981 and recipients were asked to provide information on past, present and planned exchanges with China. Though asked to reply by May 1, a number of institutions delayed responding so that data on students/scholars accepted for the 1981-82 academic year could be included. At the time this survey was prepared (August 1981), 180 schools (58 percent) had responded. (Appendix A lists the colleges and universities that responded to the inquiry.) Sixteen institutions responded but did not complete the questionnaire either because they had not yet accepted students or scholars from the PRC or the first Chinese students/scholars were not due to arrive on campus until the fall of 1981; a few stated they did not have adequate information or staff time. Completed questionnaires were received from 164 schools.

Based on the number of visas issued by the U.S. Embassy in Beijing and American Consulates in Shanghai and Guangzhou, the Department of State estimated that 6,000 PRC students and scholars were in the United States in mid-1981. Some, perhaps as many as a few hundred, were studying at research laboratories, businesses and other institutions not included in this survey, but most were believed to be in colleges and universities. The schools participating in this survey reported that the total number of PRC students and scholars on campuses during the 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81 academic years was 3,467. The lack of centralized information probably resulted in some underreporting and double-counting, but it is surprising that the survey accounts for only 58 percent of the 6,000 total reported by the Department of State because most schools known to have large numbers of Chinese nationals responded to the questionnaire. Either the State Department estimate is too high (because many who received visas did not come to the United States or a larger number of PRC students and scholars has returned to China than the Department of State supposes) or the remaining 2,500 students and scholars are distributed among far more institutions than were included in the list compiled by the Clearinghouse. It is also possible that both propositions are true.

II. Geographic and Institutional Distribution of PRC Students and Scholars

Although the number and variety of colleges and universities hosting students and scholars from the PRC increased substantially between 1980 and 1981, the geographic distribution remained almost the same. Schools in the Far West, primarily in California, have received more PRC citizens (26 percent) than have those in any other region.* This percentage is almost exactly the same as that for 1980 (25.8 percent), but the number of students and scholars has increased from 253 to 1,328. New York has the second largest concentration of PRC students and scholars (674 or 13 percent); each of two regions, New England and the upper Midwest (Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin), has 12 percent of the total. Appendix B lists the number of institutions reporting, the total number of PRC students and scholars on campuses in the 1979-80 and 1980-81 academic years and those anticipated in 1981-82 and the percentage distribution for each of the 12 NAFSA regions.

The institutional distribution of students and scholars from the PRC reveals heavy concentrations in relatively few schools. More specifically, the 25 schools having more than 40 PRC students and scholars account for 65 percent of the total reported in the survey. (A list of these institutions is in Appendix C.) The first 20 institutions account for 59 percent of the total; the first 10 have 42 percent. All ten institutions having the greatest number of PRC students and scholars register more than 80; six have more than 100.

At the ten schools with the most students and scholars from China, PRC citizens represent between 0.3 and 2 percent of the total enrollment and between 5 and 20 percent of foreign student enrollment. Data needed to compare the number of scholars from China to the total number of visiting scholars or the number of visiting scholars from other countries were not available.

Two observations should be made regarding the concentration of Chinese students and scholars. One concerns the ratio of PRC citizens to other foreigners on campus. Although comparing Chinese students and scholars as a unit to the total number of foreign students exaggerates the ratio somewhat by omitting other foreign scholars, the point remains that China has done comparatively well in securing admission to some of the leading research universities in the United States. A second observation has to do with the ratio of PRC students and scholars to total student enrollments; even at those institutions with the highest concentrations, the numbers involved represent only a small percentage of the total student body.

---

*The regional groupings in this report are those used by NAFSA.

Data elsewhere in this summary will document the various forms of sponsorship and financial support, but it should be noted in passing that students and scholars on J-1 visas (primarily those sponsored by the Chinese government) represent a far higher percentage of total PRC contingents at the ten leading schools than is the case for the country as a whole. This doubtless results from both careful "targeting" by PRC authorities and the willingness of those schools to weigh heavily the fact that individuals have been identified by the Chinese government (through a variety of screening procedures) as the "best" of their generations.

Another noteworthy characteristic of the distribution of PRC students and scholars is that whereas scholars and graduate students are concentrated in relatively few institutions, undergraduates tend to be distributed among a large number of schools. A similar contrast exists with respect to government-sponsored students/scholars (concentrated) and those with private sponsorship (scattered among far more institutions).

III. Profile of Students and Scholars from China

Educational exchanges between the United States and the People's Republic of China resumed in 1978 with the arrival of a few dozen visiting scholars (mid-career specialists) sponsored by the Chinese Academy of Sciences. They were soon joined by a small number of undergraduates and English as a second language (ESL) students; the first graduate students from China arrived during the 1979–80 academic year. Table 1 indicates the changing numbers and percentages of PRC citizens at the responding institutions in each of six categories: degree-seeking undergraduate, special undergraduate (i.e., not enrolled in a degree program), degree-seeking graduate, special graduate (not enrolled in a degree program), scholars and other (primarily ESL).

One of the clearest trends recorded in Table 1 is the relative decline in the percentage of visiting scholars and the sharp increase in the number/percentage of graduate students. When exchanges resumed, the Chinese government attached highest priority to sending mid-career specialists to the United States for advanced training. Although some in this category had been trained in the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe during the 1950s and early 1960s, most had been educated in China and virtually all were in basic science or engineering disciplines. Government officials were eager to send these people to American and other foreign universities for advanced training to help overcome the deleterious consequences of the Cultural Revolution (1966–76) during which many professionals were unable to teach, conduct research or keep abreast of developments in their fields. It was hoped that after one or two years of advanced training in the United States these scholars could use what they had learned to raise the level of teaching and research in their own country and build upon newly established personal ties with American faculty to develop joint projects and future study opportunities for their own students. As will be discussed below, the majority (72 percent) of visiting scholars have been sponsored and supported by the Chinese government.

The decline in the absolute number and percentage of visiting scholars appears to have been caused by a variety of factors. On the Chinese side, the decrease seems attributable, in part, to depletion of the pool of mid-career applicants with requisite English language skills. Competing demand for the services of those who might come to the United States but were needed to teach and/or conduct research has also been a factor, as has the creation of a new pool of capable graduate students (see below). Another determinant may have been a change in the attitude and capabilities of American host institutions and departments. Interest in having scholars from China was quite high in 1979–80, and many faculty members and institutions were willing to bend normal procedures to make it possible for visiting scholars from the PRC to arrive on short notice and without clear prior knowledge of the type program envisioned. Once exchanges were resumed and initial contacts

established, faculty and institutions began to follow normal procedures (including joint design of research projects and application for funding). As a result, Chinese applicants had to compete with other candidates on a somewhat different basis than was the case in 1979 (or whenever exchanges with the PRC began at a particular school).

China initially elected to concentrate on sending visiting scholars to the United States for at least two additional reasons: visiting scholars usually did not have to pay tuition and fees and there was no readily available pool of potential graduate students. When universities and colleges in China reopened in 1971–72, length of programs was shortened and academic standards were lowered substantially from what they had been prior to 1966. Education officials in China determined that few of those who had graduated between 1974 and 1977 were adequately prepared for study abroad and that those who had graduated prior to 1966 needed time to relearn what had been forgotten during the interim. Eager to ensure that the first graduate students—like the first visiting scholars—were the best the country could produce, officials decided to limit the number of graduate students sent abroad until the first groups trained in the more demanding curricula instituted in 1978 began to graduate in 1981.* The entrance of this group into the applicant pool is reflected in the partial figures for 1981–82 presented in Table 1.

The small but growing number of regular graduate students is also a reflection of the admissions policies of American institutions. Unclear as to just how well prepared applicants were, uncertain how to interpret credentials and unaccustomed to the unusual backgrounds of many candidates, most admissions officers decided to move slowly. As the first graduate students demonstrated their abilities and universities became more familiar with Chinese credentials and undergraduate programs, the number accepted began to increase. Another factor contributing to the increase is greater Chinese familiarity with application procedures and the range of schools to which students might apply. (It should be noted that in 1978–80 most applications were sent to a small number of American institutions; most schools did not receive any applications because the Chinese did not know about them or the strength of their programs.)

The number of undergraduates from China increased sharply in 1980–81 as a result of arrangements made by friends and relatives outside the PRC. All the undergraduates listed in Table 1 are privately sponsored (by friends or relatives or through scholarships provided by schools or other agencies). Officials in Beijing have decided to sponsor *only* graduate students and visiting scholars, on the grounds that Chinese institutions provide adequate undergraduate instruction. Partial figures for 1981–82 indicate that privately sponsored undergraduates will continue to come to the United States in roughly the same numbers as in 1980–81.

---

*Although the first class selected on the basis of new competitive examinations was not enrolled until March 1978 and most members of this class will not graduate until February 1982, extra courses, summer study and other arrangements enabled some students to graduate a semester early (i.e., in June 1981). The class of 1981 also included students admitted prior to 1978 who were permitted to shift into new four year programs.

Table 1 projects a sharp increase in the number of special graduate students in 1981–82 but the increase results in large part from a novel eight to ten week language development and cultural orientation program conducted by a community college in New York. (Of the 70 special graduate students reported for the 1980–81 academic year, 25 were enrolled in this program; for 1981–82 the figures are 75 of 153.) After co.npleting that program, students will transfer to other institutions. The number of undergraduate students in special status is declining slightly, but the percentage in the overall total remains constant.

Many of the Chinese nationals included in the "other" category were in ESL programs. The number of these students also appears to be decreasing, a result perhaps of improved English training facilities in China and the reluctance of the Chinese government to finance ESL training in the United States for government-sponsored students and scholars. The category of "other" also includes postgraduate medical school trainees, language interns, coaches, international visitors and workshop and conference participants.

(Note: Because of the small number of PRC nationals in the United States in the 1978–79 academic year and the limited information available about these students and scholars, statistics for 1978–79 are not included in the remainder of the survey summary.)

TABLE 1: PRC STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS ACCEPTED BY U.S. INSTITUTIONS

	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81	1978–81 Total	1981–82*
Degree-seeking undergraduate students	5 (9%)	70 (6%)	267 (12%)	342 (10%)	247 (14%)
Special undergraduate students	——	18 (2%)	39 (2%)	57 (2%)	26 (2%)
Degree-seeking graduate students	——	171 (16%)	405 (18%)	576 (17%)	626 (36%)
Special graduate students	——	10 (1%)	70 (3%)	80 (2%)	153 (9%)
Scholars	36 (67%)	676 (61%)	1,233 (52%)	1,945 (56%)	592 (34%)
Other	13 (24%) (ESL: 11 or 20%)	155 (14%) (ESL: 52 or 5%)	299 (13%) (ESL: 130 or 6%)	467 (13%) (ESL: 193 or 6%)	80 (5%) (ESL: 34 or 2%)
Total	54 (100%)	1,100 (100%)	2,313 (100%)	3,467 (100%)	1,724 (100%)

*Many responding institutions had only partial or preliminary figures for 1981–82 when completing the survey questionnaire. As a result, the 1981–82 projections reported in this summary understate the true numbers in each category but probably reflect relative distributions reasonably well.

A. CHINESE INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF PRC STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS

Tables 2-4 show the Chinese institutional affiliations of the PRC students and scholars who arrived at the schools responding to this survey in 1979-80 and 1980-81 and who are scheduled to arrive in 1981-82. A number of trends are clear; few are surprising.

TABLE 2: CHINESE INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATIONS— UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Colleges and universities	46 (64%)	194 (73%)	243 (77%)
Chinese Academy of Sciences	13 (18%)	13 (5%)	9 (3%)
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences	3 (4%)	3 (1%)	6 (2%)
Government agencies	——	7 (3%)	12 (4%)
Other (middle schools, foreign language institutes, technical schools, jobs)	10 (14%)	49 (18%)	45 (14%)
Total	72 (100%)	266 (100%)	315 (100%)

TABLE 3: CHINESE INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATIONS— GRADUATE STUDENTS

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Colleges and universities	83 (58%)	199 (60%)	286 (54%)
Chinese Academy of Sciences	45 (32%)	84 (25%)	161 (27%)
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences	1 (1%)	10 (3%)	8 (2%)
Government agencies	4 (3%)	18 (5%)	21 (4%)
Other (research institutes, foreign language institutes, media and other professions)	9 (6%)	22 (7%)	70 (13%)
Total	142 (100%)	333 (100%)	546 (100%)

TABLE 4: CHINESE INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATIONS—SCHOLARS

	1979–80	1980–81	1981–82
Colleges and universities	152 (47%)	485 (56%)	246 (55%)
Chinese Academy of Sciences	119 (37%)	231 (27%)	129 (29%)
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences	——	15 (2%)	19 (4%)
Government agencies	21 (7%)	72 (8%)	35 (8%)
Other (research and scientific institutes, medical facilities, industries, media and other professions)	30 (9%)	60 (7%)	20 (4%)
Total	322 (100%)	863 (100%)	449 (100%)

Given the turbulence of education in China during the Cultural Revolution decade and uncertainty about how to evaluate the preparation and academic potential of middle (secondary) school graduates, it is not surprising that most undergraduates have come from colleges and universities rather than directly from middle schools. The fact that a student had made it through the rigorous screening process used to select men and women for the relatively few college openings each year (270,000 for approximately 5 million applicants) was probably reassuring to admissions officers asked to make decisions without the familiar credentials or standardized tests. College students were clearly a safer bet than recent middle school graduates who had not yet enrolled in a college or university in China.

Although the absolute numbers are small, it is surprising to discover that a few undergraduates have come from institutes of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) because these institutes do not provide undergraduate instruction. Several institutes have graduate students but none are known to have undergraduates.

The steady increase in the number of graduate students from all sources except the CASS reflects an expanding applicant pool, increasing familiarity with PRC credentials and the involvement of more American institutions each year. The survey did not request information on the precise Chinese institutional affiliation (i.e., the names of PRC schools and institutes) but narrative comments and Clearinghouse data indicate that most graduate students come from relatively few key schools such as Beijing, Qinghua and Fudan universities.

The partial statistics reported in this survey suggest that, with the exception of the CASS, all institutions that sent visiting scholars in 1980–81 will send fewer in 1981–82. CASS institutes sent no scholars in 1979–80, and the total for each subsequent year remains far below that of other sending institutions. Since the CASS

was newly created in 1977 and has had to concentrate on organizational matters, the delay in sending scholars is understandable and the numbers might continue to increase for a few more years, especially if the training of managers, economists and certain other social scientists maintains its newly attained priority. Like graduate students, visiting scholars appear to come mainly from China's most prestigious key universities and colleges.

B. FIELDS OF STUDY

Consistent with the emphasis placed on science and technology by official Chinese commentaries on the country's economic and developmental needs, a large majority of all PRC graduate students and visiting scholars are in mathematics, physical science or engineering disciplines. Data collected in this survey suggest that this is true of privately sponsored as well as government-sponsored students and scholars. Interestingly, relatively more PRC undergraduates (all privately sponsored) than graduate students or scholars are studying social sciences and humanities. Tables 5-7 provide a detailed breakdown of the fields of study pursued by PRC nationals on American campuses.

The tables reveal a number of interesting trends and developments. For example, relatively more scholars than graduate students have studied medical and life sciences but the percentage of graduate students in these fields is increasing while that of scholars is decreasing. Perhaps more significant, medical and life sciences are studied *less* than either engineering or mathematics and the physical sciences. Stringent admissions and legal requirements in the United States certainly limit the number of PRC citizens able to study in medical programs, but the relatively small numbers in the biological sciences is rather surprising given China's stated emphasis on improving agriculture, animal husbandry and forestry through advances in fields such as botany, genetics and agronomy. It is, however, consistent with the low priority assigned to biology in past decades.

In recent years, China's political leaders have assigned higher priority to applied than to basic research, a fact that may be reflected in the substantial increase in the proportion of scholars (49 percent in 1981-82 compared to 31 percent in 1980-81) in engineering fields. However, the percentage of Chinese graduate students in engineering in U.S. institutions declined from 35 to 26 during the same period.

One of the most dramatic shifts during the period covered by this survey is the increase in the number of graduate students in humanities fields (from 1 student in 1979-80 to 90 in 1981-82). Since no more than 8 of the 90 humanities graduate students projected for 1981-82 are from the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, most will probably come from humanities departments in China's major colleges and universities. Just how much this reflects the priorities of individual Chinese institutions and/or the Ministry of Education, the preferences of American schools and/or the inclusion of privately sponsored students is impossible to determine from the survey results.

A strikingly high percentage of the undergraduates admitted each year (40, 39 and 30 percent) were/are/will be enrolled in ESL programs. Indeed, there

were/are/will be more undergraduate students in ESL than in any other field, at least initially. Unfortunately, there is no way to determine what fields they enter after completion of ESL training. It is interesting that the fairly large percentage of graduate students in ESL programs in 1979–80 and 1980–81 is projected to decline to only three percent in 1981–82. This no doubt reflects improved preparation in China as well as PRC government reluctance to spend foreign exchange on expensive language training abroad. The low percentage of scholars in ESL programs may simply record the fact that scholars are identified by their disciplines regardless of whether or not they take ESL courses, but it probably also reflects PRC reluctance to pay for language training. Since scholars normally do not pay fees, they usually cannot attend ESL classes without payment of some kind.

Another interesting difference at the undergraduate level is that social sciences and humanities are studied nearly as often as mathematics and physical sciences. In the academic year 1980–81, the number of PRC undergraduate students studying social sciences and humanities actually exceeded the number in mathematics and physical sciences. Engineering and medical/life sciences (here excluding medicine) do not appear to have the same emphasis at the undergraduate level as at the graduate and scholarly levels.

TABLE 5: FIELDS OF STUDY—PRC UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

	1979–80	1980–81	1981–82
Mathematics and physical sciences	24 (26%)	80 (19%)	84 (26%)
Medical and life sciences	3 (3%)	21 (5%)	24 (7%)
Engineering--all fields	5 (5%)	50 (12%)	42 (13%)
Social sciences	13 (14%)	48 (11%)	37 (11%)
Humanities	11 (12%)	61 (14%)	44 (13%)
ESL training	37 (40%)	163 (39%)	96 (30%)

TABLE 6: FIELDS OF STUDY—PRC GRADUATE STUDENTS

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Mathematics and physical sciences	88 (51%)	155 (31%)	244 (40%)
Medical and life sciences	10 (6%)	27 (5%)	60 (10%)
Engineering—all fields	43 (25%)	173 (35%)	154 (26%)
Social sciences	8 (4%)	34 (7%)	35 (6%)
Humanities	1 (.5%)	50 (10%)	90 (15%)
ESL training	24 (14%)	54 (12%)	18 (3%)

TABLE 7: FIELDS OF STUDY—PRC SCHOLARS

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Mathematics and physical sciences	162 (37%)	472 (45%)	108 (28%)
Medical and life sciences	72 (17%)	160 (16%)	44 (11%)
Engineering—all fields	171 (40%)	324 (31%)	187 (49%)
Social sciences	13 (3%)	25 (2%)	14 (4%)
Humanities	5 (1%)	33 (3%)	12 (3%)
ESL training	8 (2%)	33 (3%)	20 (5%)

C. EVALUATION OF STUDENT/SCHOLAR PERFORMANCE

The variety and uniqueness of programs undertaken by individual Chinese scholars (ranging from auditing classes to designing important experiments) make it impossible to generalize about how easily they have moved into programs for training and research or how well they have done after settling in. Informal Clearinghouse surveys of faculty sponsors found that most are basically satisfied with the PRC scholars they have worked with, even though many note particular difficulties such as inadequate English ability or lack of familiarity with developments in their field. The latter observation is readily understandable given the disruptions of the Cultural Revolution.

In the Clearinghouse survey, 31 percent of responding institutions stated that PRC students and scholars have been able to move into programs of study/research with relatively little difficulty. Another 27 percent commented that Chinese citizens have been especially well prepared for their programs. However, slightly more than one-quarter (28 percent) stated that PRC students and scholars evinced weaknesses or gaps in previous training and an additional 14 percent said their previous training had been excessively narrow.

Many institutions were unable to compare the academic performance of Chinese graduate and undergraduate students to that of other foreign or American students because they either lacked sufficient data for comparison or felt it was too soon to tell. However, as indicated in Table 8, those responding to the questionnaire overwhelmingly judged the performance of PRC students to be as good as or better than that of American or other foreign students. Their judgment is based on grades received. Narrative responses frequently commented on the diligence of those from the PRC and that they seemed to be doing well even though explicit comparisons were not always possible. Responses stating that Chinese performed less well than others often blamed the situation on inadequate English proficiency.

TABLE 8: COMPARISON OF GRADES OF PRC STUDENTS TO THOSE OF OTHER FOREIGN AND AMERICAN STUDENTS

	Better	Same	Worse
Other foreign undergraduates	38 (49%)	36 (46%)	4 (5%)
All undergraduates	30 (52%)	25 (43%)	3 (5%)
Other foreign graduate students	25 (45%)	30 (52%)	2 (3%)
All graduate students	24 (45%)	26 (49%)	3 (6%)

D. CONTINUITY, CHANGES AND COMPLETION OF PROGRAMS

Questions designed to learn how many students and scholars have returned to China, changed programs or moved to other institutions revealed that most have continued in their original programs. Even though a number of schools noted that they did not maintain detailed or readily accessible records, the following information was reported. Since 1979, 193 PRC students and scholars have returned to China, 197 have transferred to other U.S. institutions, 157 have remained at the initial school but changed to a new status or program and 1,506 continued in their original programs. Inadequate records or reporting may understate actual totals, but the magnitudes are probably correct. Thus, a relatively small number of PRC citizens had returned to China at the time of the survey. Survey data show that almost as many Chinese students and scholars have switched to new programs at their original institutions as have transferred to other schools. Many in these categories probably moved from intensive English language training to regular academic programs.

IV. English Language Skills

American colleges and universities have used a wide variety of methods to assess the English language proficiency of PRC applicants. One-third (35 percent) request evaluations by a native speaker of English who knows the applicant and 27 percent rely on evaluations made by PRC institutions. Other methods include requesting that applicants in Beijing and Shanghai take the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency (MTELP), which is administered only in those cities (17 percent), and reliance on tests given in China by the Ministry of Education (7 percent). Twenty-two percent employ other methods such as interviews in China by visiting American faculty members, evaluation of statements written by candidates as part of the application process or letters of evaluation from Chinese English instructors. Even when other (preliminary) methods of evaluation are used, more than half (62 percent) of the responding institutions administer English proficiency tests to all PRC students and scholars after they arrive on campus. One university requires all PRC students to enroll in full-time, intensive English courses prior to academic registration.

Whether language deficiences were known at the time of acceptance or diagnosed after arrival, some additional English language training has been necessary in most cases. Fifty-nine percent of the 125 institutions responding to this question said that most PRC students required additional English language training; 19 percent stated that some needed it and 22 percent said few did so. The situation is similar in the case of scholars: 52 percent of those answering the question indicated most; 22 percent some; and 26 percent said few needed additional language instruction. It should be noted, however, that only 72 institutions answered this question for scholars.

For both PRC students and scholars, aural comprehension was the most common language deficiency with limited speaking ability cited almost as often. Students had more problems with writing ability and grammar than did visiting scholars; the opposite was true with respect to vocabulary. Reading comprehension seems to cause the fewest difficulties for both students and scholars.

Most Chinese students and scholars who received additional English language instruction after arriving in the United States did so at the same institutions where they were pursuing other academic courses (84 percent of the students and 90 percent of the scholars). Responses indicated that PRC students and scholars have received English language training at all levels from basic to advanced and to correct particular deficiencies.

V. Admissions Policies and Procedures

The first PRC students and scholars admitted to American colleges and universities were chosen in unusual ways, often on the basis of very fragmentary information. Decisions often were based on curriculum vitae supplied by the Chinese Academy of Sciences or another sponsoring organization with no direct communication between the applicant and the department or program to which he or she was applying. Those nominated by sponsoring agencies in China had been chosen through rigorous nomination and screening procedures and many, in both China and the United States, apparently felt that it would be unnecessary or inappropriate to question the ability of people selected by a responsible and respected agency of the Chinese government.

Information on prospective students and scholars was relayed to American institutions through a variety of unorthodox channels. Folders were often handed to visiting American faculty who were asked to make on-the-spot decisions or to take the information back to the United States for further consideration. Few applicants wrote directly to universities, departments, faculty or offices of admissions. While precise data are not available, it appears that a substantial number of these early and unorthodox applications were successful.

This situation began to change in 1979–80 as Chinese officials, scholars and students became more familiar with American admissions procedures and as the colleges and universities that had received the first students/scholars began to "normalize" procedures with respect to China.

Since few institutions keep records on unsuccessful applicants that would facilitate easy comparison of success rates, it is impossible to know whether applicants from China have been relatively more or less successful than those from other countries. However, the limited information collected in this survey suggests that, at least at those schools responding to this question, the acceptance rate has been relatively high.

The pattern of applications in each of the three general categories (undergraduates, graduate students and scholars) closely resembles that of successful applicants. Applications from scholars increased from 1978–79 through 1980–81, but declined for the 1981–82 academic year; applications from candidates for both graduate and undergraduate study increased steadily every year.

Despite the often unorthodox manner in which applications were sent to responsible offices or committees in the United States and the lack of familiarity with credentials from China, 48 percent of the institutions responding to the survey reported that they applied the same criteria when assessing applications from Chinese candidates as for all other applicants. Of the schools that said they had applied special criteria, 40 percent stated that this was a temporary measure designed to resume exchanges with China and 75 percent said special procedures were destined to end as soon as normally required standardized tests (e.g., TOEFL, GRE, SAT, etc.) are administered in the PRC. Only 15 percent reported that the

application of special criteria was the result of a specific agreement with a Chinese institution.

Exceptions to normal admissions procedures for PRC applicants most often involved the waiving of requirements for U.S. standardized test scores. The most frequently waived test was TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) which is normally required of all non-native speakers of English. The section, "English Language Skills" (see page 17), discusses some of the methods used to evaluate English competence in lieu of TOEFL (which has been waived by 99 percent of the institutions that employed special evaluative criteria).

The Graduate Record Examination (GRE) has been waived by 67 percent of the institutions that reported making exceptions. Fewer schools (35 percent) stated that they waived Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) requirements, and even smaller percentages waived test requirements for professional schools (Graduate Management Aptitude Test [GMAT], 26 percent; Law School Aptitude Test [LSAT], 19 percent). That the GRE is waived more often is probably a result of several factors. More PRC citizens have applied for graduate than for undergraduate programs and relatively few applications from China have been received by U.S. business and law schools, perhaps because of the lower priority given to those fields of study by the Chinese. However, the knowledge that certain admissions examinations are waived more often than others may also have influenced the pattern of applications.

Although certain standardized test requirements were waived, a number of institutions commented that such tests were administered after the Chinese students arrived on campus and that they were not permitted to enroll in regular academic programs unless they received adequate scores.

Twenty-two percent of responding institutions have special policies regarding the acceptance and/or support of scholars from the PRC. These policies frequently include waiver of tuition and other fees and of normally required examinations, granting of faculty status with appropriate privileges, providing housing, permitting free auditing of classes or accepting any scholar nominated by the Chinese Ministry of Education or Chinese Academy of Sciences. Agreements with specific Chinese institutions often provide for these or other special procedures.

Given the high concentration of PRC graduate students and visiting scholars in relatively few schools, it is appropriate to ask whether this results from the application of more lenient criteria and the waiving of normal requirements. The situation is far from clear, but the adoption of special procedures apparently has made some difference; just how much difference is impossible to determine.

Of the 25 colleges and universities that had received more than 40 students and scholars from the PRC between 1979 and the 1980–81 academic year, 5 reported that they did not have a special policy for visiting scholars from China; 14 indicated that they did have a special policy; and 6 did not answer this question. With respect to students, the same 25 schools responded as follows: 9 said they applied the same criteria as for all other students; 15 waived TOEFL; 15 waived GRE; 9 waived SAT; 6 waived GMAT; 6 waived LSAT; and 3 waived other requirements.

A. EVALUATION OF CREDENTIALS

Improved understanding of the various grading forms used in China and greater familiarity with changing educational policies and practices during the 32 year history of the PRC have made it somewhat easier to evaluate the credentials submitted by applicants for graduate and undergraduate study. Nevertheless, the comments of survey respondents indicate that evaluating applications from China remains a significant problem for many schools. Incomplete records, inconsistent grading methods (with no explanation of what system or scale is used), inadequate information about the schools from which candidates are applying, unavailability of U.S. standardized test scores, lack of official or consistent translations and the difficulty of assessing informal or self-study programs were mentioned as among the most troublesome problems. Other difficulties include: evaluating the level of study reached in "advanced" courses; equating narrow specializations to U.S. graduate fields; determining the significance of research experience; coping with inadequate information about course content, long delays in obtaining adequate records and insufficient differentiation between class hours and course credits; and the fact that year-by-year personal chronologies often do not match the general pattern of Chinese education (e.g., records indicating school attendance during the 1966–70 period when most institutions were closed or completion of a three year program at a school believed to have only four and five year programs).

Given this long list of problems, it is somewhat surprising that most U.S. institutions consider specific information received to be quite helpful. The items listed in Table 9 were rated as either very helpful or adequate by the indicated percentage of responding institutions.

TABLE 9: APPLICATION MATERIALS CONSIDERED VERY HELPFUL OR ADEQUATE

Item	Percent of Responding Institutions
Statements of purpose	92
Letters of recommendation	87
Tertiary school records	84
Secondary school records	70
Evaluations of English ability	70

Schools reported using the following methods/indicators to gain additional information about applicants from China: written examinations in the student's chosen field administered after arrival on campus (or, in the case of physics, administered in China); the applicant's scores on the national entrance examination for graduate or undergraduate enrollment in China; and interviews conducted in China by visiting American faculty members.*

B. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Payment of application fees has been a problem for applicants from the PRC because individuals do not have access to foreign exchange. Nevertheless, 61 percent of the schools responding to this survey reported that applicants from China must pay normal application fees. Eighty-six percent of these institutions require payment of fees by all applicants; 14 percent collect fees only from those applicants who are successful. Institutions requiring application fees receive payment in the following ways: 38 percent from the student after arrival on campus; 32 percent from other sources outside China (particularly in the case of privately sponsored students); 9 percent with foreign exchange remitted from China; and 21 percent from a variety of means including transfer of funds from individual departments within the university and loans from the international student office which must be repaid after arrival. Policies toward graduate and undergraduate students differ at various institutions, e.g., application fees are waived for graduate students and scholars (if appropriate) but not for undergraduates.

Forty-five institutions stated they have incurred additional administrative expenses as a result of processing applications/accepting students and scholars from the PRC. These costs have been absorbed by the school and include items such as long distance phone calls, cables and extra staff and volunteer time.

---

*Note: Information about the Chinese educational system, conferral of degrees in China, administration of U.S. standardized admissions tests in the PRC and placement recommendations for Chinese students is given in the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse publication, *An Introduction to Education in the People's Republic of China and U.S.-China Educational Exchanges*, revised edition, 1981. For information about individual Chinese tertiary level academic institutions, see the compilation of institutional profiles prepared by the Clearinghouse. These publications will be available in late fall/early winter 1981 from the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse, 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009 for the following postage and handling charges: single copy—$1; 5 copies—$2; 10 copies—$3.50; each additional copy—$.25.

VI. Financial Support

As the readers of this report are well aware, higher education in the United States is expensive, and students and scholars from the PRC are concentrated in some of the most expensive colleges and universities in the country. Who bears the financial burden? Myths and at times vitriolic arguments over this question have developed on both sides of the Pacific. Some, including many who welcome the resumption of educational exchanges between the United States and China, insist that the Chinese are getting a "free ride" and paying for only a tiny fraction of their students and scholars. Others argue with equal vehemence that precisely the opposite is true, that the PRC government is paying most of the costs involved. The Clearinghouse survey asked a number of questions designed to clarify the situation.

Predictably, the answer to the question "who pays" depends on what is included and just how the question is formulated. Tables 10 and 11 record the responses to the question of who pays tuition, living costs and miscellaneous direct educational expenses of PRC students and scholars. In the case of visiting scholars, the costs of most (though a declining percentage) are borne by the Chinese government. Over the entire 1979–81 period (two academic years), the Chinese government provided full or partial support to 72 percent of the PRC scholars on American campuses; partial figures for 1981–82 indicate that this is likely to decline (to 68 percent). During the same period, U.S. colleges and universities provided full or partial support to 23 percent of the scholars from China, a figure that appears likely to increase slightly in 1981–82. Significantly, but not surprisingly, only three percent of the PRC scholars in the United States during 1979–81 were supported by friends or relatives outside China.

Table 12 compares the sources of financial support of Chinese students and scholars at all 164 schools responding to this question to those of the 25 institutions having more than 40 PRC citizens on campus. Data in this table show that the percentage of scholars supported (in whole or in part) by the Chinese government is essentially the same in both cases (74 percent of those at the 25 schools with the most PRC students and scholars, 72 percent of those at all responding institutions). During the same period (1979–81), the top 25 schools provided full or partial support for 20 percent of their PRC scholars; the percentage for all responding institutions is 23.

It should be noted that financial support for visiting scholars usually is limited to living stipends since few have had to pay any fees, research costs or other charges; all indirect costs—which are often substantial in the basic science and engineering fields pursued by scholars from China—have been borne by the host department/institution.

A smaller but still substantial percentage of direct costs for graduate students has been paid by the Chinese government. Institutions responding to this question (accounting for two-thirds of the PRC graduate students in the United States in

1979-81) reported that 34 percent received full or partial support from the Chinese government while 26 percent obtained full or partial support from the college or university. An additional 36 percent were supported, entirely or in part, by friends and relatives outside China.

Unlike the situation with scholars, there is a significant difference between the pattern of support for students at the 25 institutions with large concentrations of Chinese citizens and the overall situation. Whereas only 34 percent of all PRC students in the United States were supported by the Chinese government, the number climbs to 52 percent at the schools with 40 or more PRC students and scholars. This doubtless reflects the targeting of specific schools by the Chinese government and sponsoring agencies in the PRC as well as a greater willingness/ability of those schools to accept applicants from China precisely because the costs are borne by the student's home government. The percentage of PRC students in the top 25 schools who receive financial support from the institution is identical to the national total (26 percent).

Tables 10 and 11 show a slight increase in support for PRC students and scholars by U.S. businesses, but this still represents a very small segment of the overall total, as does support from international agencies. Only a few Chinese students and scholars earn money through part-time employment.

The very small percentage of students and scholars receiving assistance from funds earmarked for PRC exchanges is consistent with the fact that only 11 percent of the responding institutions reported having established a special fund to assist PRC students and scholars and only one percent plan to do so in the future. Some of the "special funds" are a result of specific exchange agreements with Chinese institutions (see "Exchange Agreements and Other Institutional Arrangements," pages 35-37).

U.S. institutions provide financial assistance to Chinese students and scholars in numerous ways, e.g., by waiving tuition (40 percent); providing full living stipends (18 percent) or supplemental stipends (14 percent); by arranging for assistantships or fellowships (51 percent); and through other forms of support such as travel funds, health insurance coverage, book allowances or loans (15 percent).

Forty-two percent of the institutions responding to this survey reported that the living stipends of PRC government-sponsored students and scholars are not adequate. These respondents stated that $100 to $300 more per month is needed; predictably, the higher figure and the most complaints about inadequate support came from schools in large metropolitan areas and in regions with higher living costs.

TABLE 10: SOURCES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR PRC STUDENTS

	1979–80	1980–81	1979–81 Total	1981–82
Fully supported by PRC government	125 (37%)	234 (26%)	359 (29%)	241 (24%)
Partially supported by PRC government	14 (4%)	54 (6%)	68 (5%)	103 (10%)
Fully supported by U.S. institution	30 (9%)	143 (16%)	173 (14%)	219 (22%)
Partially supported by U.S. institution	50 (15%)	104 (12%)	154 (12%)	127 (13%)
Supported by American business firm	2 (1%)	10 (1%)	12 (1%)	34 (4%)
Supported by friends or relatives in U.S.	99 (29%)	305 (34%)	404 (33%)	171 (18%)
Supported by friends or relatives in third country	13 (4%)	25 (3%)	38 (3%)	51 (5%)
Supported by special funds earmarked for PRC nationals	——	9 (1%)	9 (1%)	24 (3%)
Supported by international agencies, e.g., WHO, UNDP	1 (.3%)	7 (1%)	8 (1%)	4 (.4%)
Supported through part-time employment	3 (1%)	11 (1%)	14 (1%)	13 (1%)

TABLE 11: SOURCES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR PRC SCHOLARS

	1979–80	1980–81	1979–81 Total	1981–82
ully supported by PRC government	281 (75%)	531 (61%)	812 (65%)	326 (56%)
artially supported by PRC government	29 (8%)	61 (7%)	90 (7%)	69 (12%)
ully supported by U.S. institution	27 (7%)	179 (20%)	206 (17%)	91 (16%)
artially supported by U.S. institution	23 (6%)	46 (5%)	69 (6%)	59 (10%)
upported by American business firm	3 (1%)	8 (1%)	11 (1%)	6 (1%)
upported by friends or relatives in U.S.	9 (2%)	34 (4%)	43 (3%)	16 (3%)
upported by friends or relatives in third country	1 (.3%)	2 (.2%)	3 (.2%)	1 (.2%)
upported by special funds earmarked for PRC nationals	1 (.3%)	2 (.2%)	3 (.2%)	——
upported by international agencies, e.g., WHO, UNDP	——	13 (1%)	13 (1%)	7 (1%)
upported through part-time employment	——	1 (.1%)	1 (.1%)	2 (.4%)

TABLE 12: SOURCES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR PRC STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS, 1979–81

	At 25 Institutions with more than 40 PRC Nationals on Campus		At All 164 Responding Institutions	
	Students	Scholars	Students	Scholars
Fully supported by PRC government	240 (45%)	512 (69%)	359 (29%)	812 (65%)
Partially supported by PRC government	35 (7%)	34 (5%)	68 (5%)	90 (7%)
Fully supported by U.S. institution	66 (12%)	120 (16%)	173 (14%)	206 (17%)
Partially supported by U.S. institution	74 (14%)	26 (4%)	154 (12%)	69 (6%)
Supported by American business firm	2 (.3%)	4 (.5%)	12 (1%)	11 (1%)
Supported by friends or relatives in U.S.	88 (17%)	36 (5%)	404 (33%)	43 (3%)
Supported by friends or relatives in third country	21 (4%)	—	38 (3%)	3 (.2%)
Supported by special funds earmarked for PRC nationals	2 (.3%)	3 (.4%)	9 (1%)	3 (.2%)
Supported by international agencies, e.g., WHO, UNDP	3 (.6%)	4 (.5%)	8 (1%)	13 (1%)
Supported through part-time employment	—	—	14 (1%)	1 (.1%)
Total	531 (100%)	739 (100%)	1,239 (100%)	1,251 (100%)

VII. Visa and Administrative Information

A. VISAS

Students and scholars from the People's Republic of China come to the United States on one of two types of visas—F-1 or J-1. Generally speaking, full-time students who are privately sponsored (i.e., who are not formally nominated or financially supported by the Chinese government) enter the country on F-1 (student) visas. Visiting scholars and students who are officially sponsored by the Chinese government (or are under certain other programs) enter on J-1 (exchange visitor) visas. When the Clearinghouse questionnaire was distributed in the spring of 1981, Department of State records showed that approximately 3,500 F-1 and 2,500 J-1 visas had been issued to PRC citizens (58 percent and 42 percent, respectively).

Institutions responding to the Clearinghouse questionnaire provided visa information on 88 percent of the PRC students and scholars accepted in 1979–80 and 91 percent of those accepted in 1980–81; the percentage dropped to 75 in the projection for 1981–82. As is indicated in Table 13, the ratio of F-1 to J-1 visas at the reporting institutions was quite different from the overall figures of the Department of State.

TABLE 13: VISA INFORMATION FOR PRC STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS

	1979–80	1980–81	1981–82
F-1 Visas	231 (24%)	664 (31%)	533 (41%)
J-1 Visas	742 (76%)	1,452 (69%)	768 (59%)

The ratio of F-1 to J-1 visas held by PRC students and scholars at the colleges and universities responding to the Clearinghouse questionnaire indicates that the survey elicited information about most of the government-sponsored students and scholars on American campuses. Even though visa information was reported for only 89 percent of the PRC students and scholars reported to be on campuses in 1979–81, the total number of J-1 visas reported for 1979–81 (2,194) represents 88 percent of the approximately 2,500 J-1 visas issued by the Department of State during that period.

The fact that the survey collected information on such a high percentage of all government-sponsored students and scholars increases the credibility of the previously reported finding that those with government sponsorship are concentrated in relatively few but highly regarded institutions. It also suggests that the findings with respect to sources of financial support are probably skewed to show that the

Chinese government sponsors a higher percentage of all students and scholars than is actually the case. Since most of those not registered in this survey are on F-1 visas (privately sponsored), it is probable that the percentage supported by friends and relatives outside China actually is somewhat higher than reported in Table 10, and that the relative amount of financial assistance provided by American colleges and universities may be understated.

Thirty-five institutions reported that PRC students or scholars on their campuses had experienced delay and difficulty in obtaining passports, and 42 schools reported difficulties in obtaining U.S. visas. Unfortunately, the survey did not ask (and schools did not report) the number who had experienced passport and/or visa problems. That problems exist is certain, but their magnitude and causes were not discovered in this survey.

B. INSURANCE

Health insurance for PRC citizens—or more accurately the lack of insurance—continues to be a vexing issue for administrators and faculty sponsors, but the situation has improved markedly in the past year. Eighty-nine schools reported that most PRC students and scholars on campus have health insurance (23 of these institutions noted that all their foreign students are required to purchase health insurance). Nineteen institutions stated that some PRC citizens were covered by insurance programs and 16 reported that few were insured. Government-sponsored students and scholars can be covered by a cooperative health insurance plan administered by the Chinese Embassy. Those who participate in the plan have a monthly fee deducted from their living stipends; the embassy then assumes responsibility for covering medical expenses. Students and scholars not covered by the embassy plan sometimes enroll in the insurance plans of the institutions they attend, but scholars are not always eligible. Where they have the choice of not purchasing health insurance, many PRC students and scholars exercise that option because they do not understand how expensive health care can be and are not willing to pay the cost from their low monthly stipends. Institutions with mandatory insurance plans for foreign students have not reported any problems in having Chinese students enroll in them.

C. HOUSING AND OTHER PROBLEMS

A number of schools reported having to cope with housing-related problems of PRC students and scholars. The list of difficulties includes: finding inexpensive accommodations close to campus or public transportation; unfamiliarity with types of housing available in the United States, with methods for locating a suitable apartment or rooming house and the significance of a lease; shortage of furnished housing; adjustments to dormitory living, American food and life styles; short notices of arrival which require locating temporary housing until permanent arrangements can be made; and problems caused by PRC nationals requesting to live in crowded

conditions in order to save money. Problems have been minimized where housing has been provided by friends or relatives or where local community groups, academic departments or faculty and students have provided special forms of assistance. Some institutions have made special provisions for inexpensive on-campus housing or low-cost off-campus housing for students and scholars from the PRC.

Other problems mentioned include: delays in obtaining passports and visas that cause untimely arrivals on campus (i.e., in the middle of a term); inadequate financial support from private sponsors, the need to find additional funding after arrival and Chinese foreign currency restrictions; insufficient English language proficiency and problems caused by China's general policy of not permitting students to come to the United States for language study alone; and occasional incidents arising from the "two Chinas" issue when students from Taiwan also are present on campus.

VIII. Non-academic Activities

Sixty-nine percent of responding institutions indicated there is a community group with which they cooperate on programs for foreign students. More than half these groups help foreign students find housing, provide home hospitality and orientation, help new arrivals obtain basic necessities, assist with medical, dental or other problems, meet foreign students and scholars upon arrival, arrange visits to local places of interest and provide informal English language practice. Slightly less than half also maintain speakers bureaus, arrange seminars, workshops and lectures and help introduce foreign guests to other social and cultural events.

Most institutions (80 percent) do not provide a special orientation for PRC students and scholars, but do include them in the orientations given to all foreign students. Individual counseling usually is provided when Chinese students and scholars arrive too late to participate in regular orientation sessions. At a number of institutions, academic departments that sponsor Chinese students or scholars help new arrivals settle in and provide information about non-academic programs and activities. Local Chinese-American groups and associations formed to promote Chinese-American friendship also arrange special programs in many campus communities.

When asked whether Chinese students and scholars participate in the programs arranged for foreign students, 33 percent of the responding institutions said they often do so, 41 percent said occasionally, 22 percent answered infrequently and 4 percent said never. PRC students and scholars seem to be most interested in informal English language practice, home hospitality, visits to schools and local points of interest and orientation to the community. Several institutions also mentioned that Chinese students and scholars participate in organized trips to more distant attractions such as Williamsburg, Niagara Falls and Yosemite National Park. They also enjoy gatherings such as folk-dancing and evening programs offering opportunities for informal conversation with Americans.

IX. Exchange Agreements and Other Institutional Arrangements

In addition to students and scholars sponsored by agencies of the Chinese government (principally the Ministry of Education, the Chinese Academy of Sciences and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences) and those accepted after "direct" application to American colleges and universities, a small number (324 or 9 percent) of Chinese nationals came to the United States in 1979-81 under formal agreements concluded between American and Chinese institutions. Preliminary figures for 1981-82 indicate that 169 PRC students and scholars have already been accepted under formal institutional agreements. Table 14 gives the detailed breakdown reported by schools responding to this survey.

TABLE 14: PRC STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS IN THE UNITED STATES UNDER FORMAL INSTITUTIONAL AGREEMENTS

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Undergraduates	4	8	14
Graduate students	22	73	64
Scholars	60	157	91

Note: There are no reports of Chinese students or scholars coming to the United States in 1978-79 under formal institutional agreements.

Of the colleges and universities responding to the Clearinghouse questionnaire, 52 reported having at least one formal agreement with an institution in China; 17 schools reported agreements with more than one PRC institution. Appendix D lists the U.S. schools reporting formal agreements and the partner institution in the PRC.

Although many of those who completed the questionnaire said they did not know the details of their school's formal agreement(s), the material provided makes it clear that a variety of forms and provisions have been developed. Eighteen agreements establish formal "sister institution" relationships, but it is not clear precisely what this means or how such relationships differ from other institution-to-institution ties.

At least 33 agreements obligate the American school to *receive* a specified number of students and/or scholars from the partner institution annually, and 35

agreements permit (or commit) the American institution to *send* a designated number of students and faculty to the PRC counterpart each year. Although the Clearinghouse survey did not explore the question, there are indications that at least some U.S. institutions have had difficulty finding enough students and/or faculty to fill their "quota" of people going to China.

Twenty-eight of the formal agreements reported in this survey obligate the American institution to provide a specified number of scholarships and/or fellowships, and 24 pledge the Chinese school to provide a designated number of scholarships or stipends at various levels (i.e., from undergraduate through faculty). Ten institution-to-institution agreements cover exchanges only in selected fields such as physics, engineering, English, agronomy, agriculture, law, Chinese studies, the physical sciences or music.

Data collected through the Clearinghouse survey are inadequate to draw firm conclusions, but it should be noted that 15 (60 percent) of the 25 U.S. schools with 40 or more students and scholars from China have formal exchange agreements with PRC institutions. Whether the formal relationship is a causal or coincidental (or even a derivative) factor is impossible to determine, but it appears that such agreements had little to do with the number of PRC students and scholars on the campuses of schools with the largest number of Chinese nationals, but were of relatively greater significance at institutions with less than 50. For example, of the five schools with the largest number of students and scholars, only two (University of California at Berkeley and Columbia University) have formal exchange agreements.

Asked to report on the number of their students and faculty who had spent three months or longer at institutions in China under the terms of formal or other arrangements (but excluding those placed through the National Program for Advanced Study and Research in China administered by the CSCPRC), several institutions reported that they did not have complete records. The following table almost certainly understates the actual number of Americans from the responding institutions who have studied, taught or conducted research in China but it is nevertheless informative in terms of trends and general magnitude of the "reverse flow" of students and faculty.

Thirty-eight institutions reported that they had sent students and/or faculty to China for periods of three months or longer (97 stated that they had not sent anyone for that length of time). The totals (which do not include those sent under the National Program) are given in Table 15.

TABLE 15: AMERICAN STUDENTS AND FACULTY IN CHINA

	1978–79	1979–80	1980–81
Undergraduates	—	4	53
Graduate students	—	18	17
Faculty	8	38	74

Forty-eight schools reported that they plan to send students and/or faculty to China in 1981–82; projected totals are: 88 undergraduates; 47 graduate students; and 81 faculty.

During the 1979–81 period, the National Program sent 83 scholars and 40 students to China for periods ranging from three months to two years; an additional 24 researchers and 22 graduate students will be supported by the National Program in 1981–82. The latter number includes six students now in China who have received permission to extend their stay for a second year.

Adding the figures reported by responding institutions to the number sent by the National Program gives a total of 335 U.S. students and faculty who have spent three months or longer studying or conducting research in PRC institutions in 1978–81. These figures do not include people who have taught English in China (estimated by the Department of State to be several hundred). The 335 figure is considerably below the estimate of 600 American students and faculty in China in mid-1981 given by the Department of State, but the latter total includes at least 200 students participating in short-term language programs that are not counted in either the survey or National Program totals.

As with PRC students and scholars in the United States, Americans studying or conducting research in China are concentrated in relatively few key universities and CAS research institutes. Most Chinese colleges and universities do not yet accept foreign students because they lack adequate facilities and personnel and/or because they are prevented from doing so by the Ministry of Education. Even at those schools that do accept foreign students some, often many, departments are closed to all but PRC citizens.

X. Concluding Observations

Educational exchanges between the United States and the People's Republic of China resumed only three years ago, but in that short time the number of PRC students and scholars on American campuses has surpassed that of all but a dozen or so other countries. The estimated total of 6,000 during the 1980-81 academic year is large—ten times greater than the number of American students and researchers who spent extended periods at Chinese institutions during 1979-81—yet it represents only one-third the number of students and scholars from Taiwan. Despite inevitable start-up problems, the rapid growth in two-way exchange has gone remarkably well.

Some will be struck by the tremendous imbalance in the flow of students and scholars between China and the United States. It should be noted, however, that similar disparities exist between the United States and all developing countries; there simply are more reasons and more opportunities to study in the United States.

There is no need to belabor the point that strict numerical equivalence is not and should not be a factor shaping exchanges, but it is worth recalling that although the population of China is four times that of the United States, the United States has five times the number of institutions of higher education. Moreover, most American institutions are accustomed to receiving foreign students and scholars; schools in China are neither accustomed nor (from their perspective) equipped to do so. As was noted previously, even at schools having the largest numbers of PRC students and scholars, Chinese nationals represent roughly one percent of total enrollment. Although the numbers are much lower, the American presence on Chinese campuses often represents a similar or even higher percentage of smaller student bodies. Both sides have done much to facilitate exchanges and it is a tribute to the patience, hard work and good will of faculty and administrators in both countries that so much has happened in so short a period.

What are the prospects for the future? To begin, it is unlikely that the number of PRC students and scholars on American campuses (and Americans in China) will continue to increase as rapidly as in the past. Chinese officials have stated that they plan to sponsor approximately 500 students and scholars each year; limited foreign exchange and the potential increase in costs associated with the shift from sending visiting scholars to graduate students impose real constraints on expansion. Another limiting factor is likely to be the changing applicant pool in China. The "backlog" of young scholars created by the Cultural Revolution produced a large group "needing to go" as soon as exchanges became possible. For a variety of reasons (including assignment to jobs, imposition of more stringent age limits and the fact that many of the "best" candidates from this group have already been sent abroad), this pool is being depleted rapidly. Future graduates of rigorous undergraduate programs in China will constitute a new, high quality pool of potential applicants, but the total number will be smaller and constant from year to year.

The number of privately sponsored Chinese students may increase as new middle school and college graduates become eligible, but the Clearinghouse has received numerous reports indicating that it is becoming quite difficult for privately sponsored students to obtain passports. What this means and what effect it will have on exchanges are impossible to predict.

The rapid growth in the number of Americans who have studied in China since 1979 is also attributable, in part, to a "backlog" of young scholars eager for the opportunity to spend time in the PRC. Many graduate students had already studied Chinese in Taiwan and would have completed their graduate studies without spending time in the PRC had new opportunities not arisen. But most of those people have now been to China, and the annual pool of prospective candidates is likely to become smaller.

Problems remain—some serious—but both sides should be quite pleased with the developments of the past three years. As the process is further "normalized," evaluation of credentials will become easier, awareness of the most appropriate programs and institutions in both the United States and China will facilitate placement and the novel will give way to the routine. The U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse has attempted to collect and disseminate information on all aspects of the exchange process and will continue to do so until the end of 1981. The Clearinghouse project will end, but the two parent bodies, the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, will continue to help in their respective associational roles in international educational exchanges. Generally speaking, NAFSA will continue to monitor information pertaining to Chinese students and scholars coming to the United States and will disseminate that information through its normal channels. The CSCPRC will focus on the sending of Americans to China and opportunities for study and research in the PRC and will distribute information through its bimonthly publication *China Exchange News*.

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONS THAT RESPONDED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

American Language & Culture Institute, New York, NY
Anderson College, Anderson, IN
Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ
Armstrong College, Berkeley, CA
Ball State University, Muncie, IN
Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX
Bellevue Community College, Bellevue, WA
Berea College, Berea, KY
Bergen Community College, Paramus, NJ
BI Language Services, El Paso, TX
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA
Boston University, Boston, MA
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH
Brown University, Providence, RI
Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA
California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA
California State University—Dominguez Hills, Dominguez Hills, CA
California State University—Hayward, Hayward, CA
California State University—Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA
California State University—Northridge, Northridge, CA
Canada College, Redwood City, CA
Catholic University of America, Washington, DC
Central YMCA Community College, Chicago, IL
City University of New York—the City College, New York, NY
City University of New York—College of Staten Island, Staten Island, NY
City University of New York—La Guardia Community College, Long Island City, NY
Clemson University, Clemson, SC
Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO
Columbia University, New York, NY
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY
Delaware Technical and Community College, Wilmington, DE
Donnelly College, Kansas City, KS
Duke University, Durham, NC
Duke University Medical School, Durham, NC
East-West Center, Honolulu, HI
Eckerd College, St. Petersburg, FL
English Language and Multicultural Institute, Yellow Springs, OH
Florida International University, Miami, FL
Gallaudet College, Washington, DC
Georgetown University, Washington, DC
George Washington University, Washington, DC
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA
Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA
Goshen College, Goshen, IN
Hamline University, St. Paul, MN

Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, CA
Howard University, Washington, DC
Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, IL
Illinois State University, Normal, IL
Indiana Institute of Technology, Fort Wayne, IN
Indiana University, Bloomington, IN
Institute for Intercultural Learning, Seattle, WA
International Language Institute, Washington, DC
International School of Languages, Beverly Hills, CA
Iowa State University, Ames, IA
Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS
Lamar University, Beaumont, TX
Lehigh County Community College, Schrecksville, PA
Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA
Lock Haven State College, Lock Haven, PA
Louisiana State University—Baton Rouge, Baton Rouge, LA
Macalester College, St. Paul, MN
Mankato State University, Mankato, MN
Marshall University, Huntington, WV
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA
Miami University, Oxford, OH
Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI
Middlesex County College, Edison, NJ
Midway College, Midway, KY
Mills College, Oakland, CA
Milwaukee Area Technical College, Milwaukee, WI
Montana State University, Bozeman, MT
Monterey Institute of International Studies, Monterey, CA
Moorhead State University, Moorhead, MN
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA
New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark, NJ
New York University, New York, NY
North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC
Northeastern University, Boston, MA
North Seattle Community College, Seattle, WA
Northwestern University, Evanston, IL
Oakland University, Rochester, MI
Ohio State University, Columbus, OH
Ohio University, Athens, OH
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK
Pacific English Language Institute, San Luis Obispo, CA
Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA
Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
Pine Manor College, Chestnut Hill, MA
Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, KS
Point Park College, Pittsburgh, PA
Pomona College, Claremont, CA
Portland State University, Portland, OR
Princeton University, Princeton, NJ
Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN
Queensborough Community College, Bayside, NY
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, NY
Rockefeller University, New York, NY
Rutgers State University, New Brunswick, NJ
San Diego State University, San Diego, CA

San Francisco Conservatory of Music, San Francisco, CA
Savannah State College, Savannah, GA
Seattle Pacific University, Seattle, WA
Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ
Shoreline Community College, Seattle, WA
Siena Heights College, Adrian, MI
Springfield College, Springfield, MA
Stanford University, Stanford, CA
State University of New York—Albany, Albany, NY
State University of New York—Binghamton, Binghamton, NY
State University of New York—Buffalo, Bufalo, NY
State University of New York—Upstate Medical Center, Syracuse, NY
Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, NJ
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA
Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY
Temple University, Philadelphia, PA
Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, TN
Texas Agricultural & Mechanical University, College Station, TX
Tufts University, Medford, MA
University of Alabama, University, AL
University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ
University of Arkansas—Little Rock, Little Rock, AR
University of California—Berkeley, Berkeley, CA
University of California—Davis, Davis, CA
University of California—Irvine, Irvine, CA
University of California—Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA
University of California—Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA
University of California—Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH
University of Colorado—Boulder, Boulder, CO
University of Connecticut—Storrs, Storrs, CT
University of Delaware, Newark, DE
University of Dayton, Dayton, OH
University of Florida, Gainesville, FL
University of Georgia, Athens, GA
University of Hawaii—Manoa, Honolulu, HI
University of Houston, Houston, TX
University of Idaho, Moscow, ID
University of Illinois—Circle Campus, Chicago, IL
University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA
University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS
University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY
University of La Verne, La Verne, CA
University of Lowell, Lowell, MA
University of Maryland—College Park, College Park, MD
University of Massachusetts—Amherst, Amherst, MA
University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI
University of Minnesota—Twin Cities, Minneapolis, MN
University of Missouri—Kansas City, Kansas City, MO
University of Nebraska—Lincoln, Lincoln, NE
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM
University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC
University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO

University of Notre Dame,
Notre Dame, IN
University of Oregon, Eugene, OR
University of Pittsburgh,
Pittsburgh, PA
University of Rhode Island,
Kingston, RI
University of Southern California,
Los Angeles, CA
University of South Florida,
Tampa, FL
University of Tennessee—Knoxville,
Knoxville, TN
University of Texas—Dallas,
Richardson, TX
University of Utah,
Salt Lake City, UT
University of Virginia,
Charlottesville, VA
University of Wisconsin—Madison,
Madison, WI
University of Wisconsin—Oshkosh,
Oshkosh, WI
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, NY
Virginia State University,
Petersburg, VA
Walla Walla College,
College Place, WA
Washington State University,
Pullman, WA
Wayne State University, Detroit, MI
Western Illinois University,
Macomb, IL
Western Michigan University,
Kalamazoo, MI
Wilson College, Chambersburg, PA
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute,
Woods Hole, MA
Wright State University, Dayton, OH
Xavier University of Louisiana,
New Orleans, LA

APPENDIX B

NUMBERS OF PRC STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS ACCEPTED BY U.S. INSTITUTIONS BY NAFSA REGIONAL DIVISIONS

NAFSA Region*		Number of Reporting Institutions	1979–80	1980–81	1981–82	Total	Percentage of Grand Total
I	(Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington)	11	24	50	62	136	3%
II	(Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming)	13	24	115	96	235	5%
III	(Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas)	10	12	26	24	62	1%
IV	(Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota)	8	56	145	118	319	6%
V	(Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin)	16	146	303	193	642	12%
VI	(Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio)	18	29	125	120	274	5%

NAFSA Region*	Number of Reporting Institutions	1979–80	1980–81	1981–82	Total	Percentage of Grand Total
VII (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee)	18	63	78	54	195	4%
VIII (Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia)	11	38	103	73	214	4%
IX (New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia)	18	74	179	211	464	9%
X (New York)	16	136	294	244	674	13%
XI (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont)	15	113	334	147	594	12%
XII (California, Hawaii, Nevada)	26	385	561	382	1,328	26%
Grand Total	180	1,100	2,313	1,724	5,137	100%

*Totals for states that are divided between two NAFSA regions (Idaho—Regions I and II; New Jersey—Regions IX and X) are recorded in only one region. Schools in Puerto Rico were not included in the survey.

APPENDIX C

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS THAT HAD MORE THAN 40 PRC NATIONALS ON CAMPUS DURING THE ACADEMIC YEARS 1978-79, 1979-80 AND 1980-81

(Listed in Order from the Largest to the Smallest Numbers of PRC Nationals on Campus 1978-81)

1. University of California, Berkeley
2. University of Wisconsin, Madison
3. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
4. Columbia University
5. Stanford University
6. University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
7. University of California, Los Angeles
8. La Guardia Community College
9. Wayne State University
10. East-West Center
11. University of Pittsburgh
12. University of Maryland, College Park
13. University of Lowell
14. University of California, Santa Barbara
15. Purdue University
16. Harvard University
17. Princeton University
18. Cornell University
19. Northwestern University
20. University of Southern California
21. International School of Languages
22. University of Massachusetts, Amherst
23. University of California, Davis
24. University of Florida, Gainesville
25. Pennsylvania State University

APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONAL AGREEMENTS

U.S. Institution	Chinese Institution	Year Agreement Signed
Boston University	Huazhong Institute of Technology	1980
Bryn Mawr College	Shanghai Foreign Languages Institute	not given
California State University at Los Angeles	Harbin Institute of Technology	1981
City College of New York	Shandong University	not given
College of Staten Island/ City University of New York	Hebei Teachers University, Shijiazhaung	1981
Columbia University	Beijing University	not given
Cornell University	Chinese Academy of Sciences	1980
	Southwestern Jiaotong University	1980
	Xi'an Jiaotong University	1980
	Fudan University	1981
	Shanghai Jiaotong University	1981
East-West Center	Ministry of Agriculture	1980
Georgetown University	East China Normal University	1980
Goshen College	Sichuan Teachers College, Chengdu	1980
	Northeast Engineering College, Shenyang	1981
Hamline University	Beijing University	1980
Harvard University	Shandong University	not given
Illinois State University	Foreign Languages Publication Bureau	1980
Indiana University	Shandong University	1980
Iowa State University	Shenyang Agricultural College	1981
Lamar University	Jilin University	1980
Louisiana State University	East China Normal University	1981

U.S. Institution	Chinese Institution	Year Agreement Signed
Michigan State University	Nankai University	1980
	Xibei University	1980
	Sichuan University	1980
	Jiangsu Academy of Agricultural Science	1980
	Heilongjiang Academy of Agricultural Science	1980
	Institute of Botany (Chinese Academy of Sciences)	1980
	Northeast College of Agriculture	1980
Montana State University	Jilin University	not given
New York University—Law School	Jilin University	1980
Northeastern University	Beijing Polytechnic University	1980
	Hunan University	1980
	Qinghua University	1981
	Shanghai University of Science & Technology	1980
Northwestern University	Fudan University	1980
Pomona College	Nanjing University	1980
Purdue University	Harbin Institute of Technology	not given
Queensborough Community College	Chinese Academy of Sciences	1980
	Ministry of Education	1980
Rutgers State University	Jilin University	1980
San Francisco Conservatory of Music	Shanghai Conservatory of Music	1981
Seton Hall University	Beijing Languages Institute	1979
	Beijing Institute of Foreign Trade	1980
	Wuhan University	1981
Siena Heights College	Jilin University, Changchun	not given
Springfield University	Beijing Institute of Physical Culture	1979
State University of New York—Albany	Fudan University	1979
	Nanjing University	1979
	Beijing University	1979

U.S. Institution	Chinese Institution	Year Agreement Signed
State University of New York—Buffalo	Chinese Academy of Sciences	1979
	Beijing Polytechnic University	1980
	Beijing Normal College	1981
	Beijing Bureau of Higher Education	1981
	Beijing Foreign Languages Institute	1981
	Beijing Institute of Economics	1981
Temple University	Nankai University	1980
	Tianjin Normal College	1981
Tufts University	Beijing Foreign Languages Institute	1981
University of California—Berkeley	Beijing University	1979
University of California—Santa Barbara	Chinese Academy of Sciences	1979
University of California—Santa Cruz	Beijing Languages Institute	1980
University of California—Los Angeles	Zhongshan University	1979
	Import-Export Commission	1980
	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences	1980
	Chinese Academy of Sciences	1980
University of Connecticut	Beijing Normal University	1980
University of Hawaii—Manoa	Beijing Foreign Languages Institute	not given
University of Iowa	East China Institute of Hydraulic Engineering, Nanjing	1980
University of Kansas	Nankai University	1980
	Nanjing University	1980
University of Maryland	Beijing University	1980
	Anhui University	1980
	Chinese University of Science & Technology	1980
University of Massachusetts	Beijing Normal University	1981

U.S. Institution	Chinese Institution	Year Agreement Signed
University of Minnesota	Jilin University of Technology	1979
	Beijing Agricultural University	1979
	Academy of Agricultural Sciences	1979
	Nankai University	1979
	Xi'an Jiaotong University	1979
	Jilin University	1979
	Fudan University	1979
	Central South Institute of Mining and Metallurgy	1980
	Beijing University	1980
	Qinghua University	1980
University of Missouri—Kansas City	Shanghai Second Medical College	1981
University of Nebraska	Beijing University	1980
	Nanjing University	1980
	East China Normal University	1980
	South China Teachers College	1980
University of Pittsburgh	Institute of Space Technology	not given
	Beijing Foreign Languages Institute	not given
	Beijing Normal University	not given
	Shandong University	not given
	Xi'an Jiaotong University	not given
	Shanghai Jiaotong University	not given
	Tianjin University	not given
University of Utah	Zhejiang University	1980
	Hangzhou University	1980
	Zhejiang Agricultural University	1980
	Zhejiang Medical University	1980
Wayne State University	Chinese University of Science & Technology	1980
	Zhejiang University	1980
	Shanghai Jiaotong University	1981
Western Michigan University	Nanjing University	1980

Other U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse Publications

An Introduction to Education in the People's Republic of China and U.S.-China Educational Exchanges, January 1980. (out of print)

Survey Summary: Students and Scholars from the People's Republic of China Currently in the United States, April 1980. (free of charge)

Sources of Financial Aid Available to Students and Scholars from the People's Republic of China, August 1980. (free of charge)

China Bound: A Handbook for American Students, Researchers and Teachers by Karen Turner Gottschang, May 1981.

Assisting Students and Scholars from the People's Republic of China: A Handbook for Community Groups by Katherine C. Donovan, July 1981.

The following materials will be published by the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse in the late fall/early winter 1981: a revised edition of *An Introduction to Education in the People's Republic of China and U.S.-China Educational Exchanges; American Study Programs in China: An Interim Report Card;* profiles of tertiary level Chinese academic institutions; and orientation materials for Chinese students and scholars coming to the United States.

These publications are available from the U.S.-China Education Clearinghouse, 1860 19th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009 for the following postage and handling charges (except where noted): single copy—$1; 5 copies—$2; 10 copies—$3.50; each additional copy—$.25.